



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,088	11/25/2000	Paul Lapstun	NPS028US	4151

24011 7590 11/18/2003

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

JORGENSEN, LELAND R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/722,088

Applicant(s)

LAPSTUN ET AL.

Examiner

Leland R. Jorgensen

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 - 11, and 14 - 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 - 11, and 14 - 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1 and 26 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett et al., USPN 5,051,736.

Claim 1

Bennett teaches a sensing device for generating orientation data when positioned or moved relative to a surface. The orientation data is indicative of an orientation of the sensing device [positional input device or stylus 10] relative to the surface [passive tablet 1]. The sensing device generates orientation data. Bennett, col. 5, lines 22 – 23, figure 1. Bennett teaches that the orientation data is indicative of three dimensions of the orientation of the sensing device, specifically the x-y position, Bennett, col. 5, lines 5 – 10, and the tilt angle, Bennett, col. 11, lines 59 – 62. The surface has coded data disposed upon the surface. The coded data has a plurality of substantially undifferentiated marks [small dots] positioned relative to a set of predetermined nominal marking positions [larger dots] and is indicative, when sensed by the sensing device, of the orientation. Bennett, col. 9, lines 57 – 62; and figure 6.

Bennett shows the stylus having a housing. Bennett, figure 2. A orientation sensor is configured to generate the orientation data using the coded data. Bennett, col. 5, lines 22 – 33; and figures 1 and 2. A communicator [communications link 11 or cable 7] is configured to

Art Unit: 2675

communicate the orientation data to a computer system. Bennett, col. 5, lines 22 – 33; and figure 1.

Claim 26

Bennett teaches a plurality of tags indicative of an identity of a region within which the tag lies, and of a reference point of the region. The region is associated with the surface. The reference point is indicative of the position of the tag within the region. Bennett, col. 5, lines 5 – 20; col. 9, line 53 – col. 10, line 3; and figures 1 and 6. Bennett teaches TACs or Tablet Address Cells as optically detectable patterns on a surface representing binary codes that indicate an X-Y position. Bennett, col. 5, lines 7 – 10.

Claim 27

Bennett teaches that each tag the plurality of tags is indicative of an identity of a region within which the tag lies and includes at least one periodic element of the coded data. Bennett, col. 10, lines 6 – 33, figure 6 and 7.

Claim 28

Bennett teaches that an orientation sensor can be configured to infer the orientation from prospective distortion of at least some of the coded data. Bennett notes, “It is also possible to determine the tilt angle of the stylus (a potentially useful piece of information in some applications) by analyzing the perspective distortion of the TAC [Tablet Address Cells] shape.” Bennett, col. 11, lines 59 – 62.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 3 – 10, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Joyce, USPN 4,814,553.

Claim 3

Bennett does not specifically teach that the sensing device has a motion sensor.

Joyce teaches that the sensing device has a motion sensor as is typical on any mouse.

The transmitter is configured to transmit the movement data to the computer system. Joyce, col. 1, lines 11 – 16.

Joyce teaches the orientation data as indicative of an orientation of the sensing device 10 relative to the surface. The sensing device generates orientation data. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59; col. 4, lines 41 – col. 5, lines 17; col. 5, lines 29 - 48. The surface has coded data disposed upon the surface. The coded data has a plurality of substantially undifferentiated marks positioned relative to a set of predetermined nominal marking positions and is indicative, when sensed by the sensing device, of the orientation. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59; col. 3, lines 47 – col. 4, lines 13. A orientation sensor generates the orientation data using at least some of the coded data. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59; col. 3, lines 47 – col. 4, lines 13.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the motion sensor as taught by Joyce with the sensing device as taught by Bennett.

Joyce invites such combination by teaching,

The mouse of the present invention relates to the second, or absolute position, category of mouse or other controllers. Such mice offer the substantial advantage of being able to ascertain the position of the mouse on a given surface, not merely in the relative sense, but in the absolute sense of being able to resolve the actual surface coordinates thereof. Consequently, such a mouse may be placed

Art Unit: 2675

on a surface and its absolute position determined without an a priori knowledge of where the mouse has been.

It will be appreciated that the present invention may advantageously be applied to the determination of absolute positions of other, non-computer related apparatus. In its simplest form, the absolute position of the mouse or control unit along a unidimensional linear or curvilinear path can be determined. For example, the height of a milling head above a work table can be accurately and absolutely determined by placing the mouse on the head adjacent the corresponding encoded pattern located along a fixed vertical member of the milling machine.

Joyce, col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 16. Joyce then adds,

The present invention, in contrast, utilizes one or more solid-state photosensitive arrays, or similar, optical arrays in conjunction with a uniquely patterned, but inexpensively manufactured, surface to effect absolute position orientation. The surface is preferably transparent permitting it to be advantageously overlaid on a chart or other graphic and includes a rectilinear pattern of irregularly spaced lines reflective to infrared light. Alternatively, an irregular checkerboard (tiled) surface may be utilized where adjacent areas are defined by differing indices of reflectivity. As the mouse is moved over the surface (the mouse may, alternatively, be held stationary and the surface moved in relation thereto), the photosensitive arrays thereof detect and output signals representative of the relative orientation between the arrays and the pattern of lines.

The irregular surface line pattern establishes an identity between mouse output signals and mouse position vectors whereby any particular output signal uniquely corresponds to a single mouse position vector on the surface. A microprocessor or similar computing device is preferably utilized to convert these output signals into meaningful mouse position data. This data may include the angular orientation of the mouse as well as its position with respect to the surface.

Joyce, col. 1, lines 48 – 63.

Claim 4

Joyce teaches that the coded data includes region identity data indicative of an identity of a region of the surface and wherein the sensing device further includes region identity sensor configured to sense the region identity data and wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit the region identity data to the computer system. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59.

Claim 5

Joyce teaches that the motion sensor is configured to generate the movement data using at least some of the coded data. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59.

Claim 6

Joyce teaches a plurality of reference points of the region. Joyce, col. 5, lines 40 – 48. Joyce teaches motion sensor is configured to generate the movement data on the basis of the sensing device's movement relative to at least one of the reference points. Joyce, col. 2, line 35 – 59.

Claim 7

Assuming that periodic elements means coded data that is spaced and repeated on a regular or periodic basis on the surface, Joyce teaches periodic elements with the motion sensor configured to generate movement data on the basis of the sensing device's movement relative to at least one of the periodic elements. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59; col. 3, lines 47 – 62; and figures 3, 5, and 6.

Claim 8

Joyce teaches that the motion sensor is configured to sample the position of the sensing device relative to the at least one reference point or periodic element to generate the movement data. Joyce, col. 2, lines 35 – 59; col. 5, lines 18 – 48.

Claim 9

Joyce teaches a estimator. Joyce, col. 5, line 49 – col. 6, line 2.

Claim 10

Joyce teaches a communicator configured to communicate the distance data to a computer system. Joyce, col. 4, lines 47 – 51.

Claim 24

Joyce teaches that the coding data is printed with infrared ink, which is substantially invisible to the unaided human eye. Joyce, col. 2, lines 39 – 42; col. 3, lines 52 – 56.

Claim 25

Joyce teaches that the coding data is printed with infrared ink. Joyce, col. 2, lines 39 – 42; col. 3, lines 52 – 56.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Joyce as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Blesser, USPN 4,577,057.

Claim 11

Joyce teaches a distance estimator. Joyce, col. 5, line 49 – col. 6, line 2.

Neither Joyce nor Bennett specifically teach that the motion sensing means is configured to use the distance estimated by the distance estimator to resolve a more accurate position of the sensing device than indicated by the at least one reference point or periodic element alone.

Blesser teaches that the motion sensing means is configured to use the distance estimated by the distance estimator to resolve a more accurate position of the sensing device on the surface than indicated by a location-indicating tag alone. Blesser, col. 2, lines 27 – 29, 33 – 35; col. 5, lines 50 – 64.

Art Unit: 2675

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the distance estimator as taught by Blesser with the sensing device as taught by Bennett and Joyce. Blesser teaches the use of systems similar to Joyce.

Digitizing tablet systems are well known in the art and are used in a variety of applications. These systems generally include a tablet, a stylus and some instrumentality for producing some form of interaction between the stylus and the tablet from which is derived digital data signals representing the position of the stylus on the tablet.

Blesser, col. 1, lines 11 – 17. Blesser teaches the drawbacks of these prior systems and teaches an improvement.

When the stylus is held in the hand of the user it is generally not held at right angles to the tablet but rather at some acute angle thereto. Furthermore, in the course of writing on the tablet the angle will very often change. In systems in which the element in the stylus which interacts with the element in the tablet is located at the exact tip of the stylus and directly contacts an element in the tablet, the angle in which the stylus is held relative to the tablet will generally not be a factor. However, if the element is not at the tip of the stylus an error, called stylus tilt error, will occur if the stylus is not exactly perpendicular to the working surface of the tablet. This will happen because the position signal produced by the location of the conductive element in the stylus relative to the grid of conductive elements in the tablet will not correspond the position where the tip of the stylus is actually in contact with the tablet. Furthermore, if the angle of tilt changes as a line or character is drawn, which is very often the case, the size of the tilt error from point to point over the line or character will change.

Blesser, col. 1, lines 41 – 60. Blesser teaches, “It is yet still another object of this invention to provide a new and improved technique for determining the position of a stylus on a work surface.” Blesser, col. 2, lines 33 – 35. Blesser teaches that its invention can be applied to all types of digitizing surfaces.

It is to be understood that the invention is applicable to any type of digitizing table system in which positional data is obtained by the interaction of some type of element in a stylus, located at some finite distance from the tip of the stylus, with an array or grid of elements in the tablet. The interaction may be realized, for example, by capacitive, inductive or acoustic coupling. The coupling

Art Unit: 2675

signal may either be emitted from the stylus or from the tablet and the elements in the tablet may either be arranged in a rectangular (Cartesian) or polar coordinate configuration. The stylus may be a pen type or pencil type or the like or even a stylus that does not have a writing (i.e. recording) element.

Blessner, col. 3, lines 45 – 57.

5. Claims 14 – 17 and 19 - 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Masaki et al, USPN 5,159,321.

Claim 14

Bennett does not teach an acceleration sensor.

Masaki teaches an acceleration sensor. Masaki, col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the acceleration sensor of Masaki with the position sensing device of Bennett. This would allow the position sensing device to “enter figures, letters, numerals, etc. into a computer to which the input device is connected, in the exact pattern followed by the input device.”

Masaki, col. 1, lines 38 – 45. See also Masaki, col. 7, lines 16 – 29.

Claim 15

Masaki teaches that the acceleration sensor is configured to sense at least two substantially orthogonal components of acceleration. Masaki, col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 1.

Claim 16

Masaki teaches a timer configured to generate a time reference as the sensing device is moved relative to the surface region. Masaki, col. 5, line 32 – 45; col. 6, lines 17 – 20.

Claim 17

Masaki teaches that the transmitter is configured to transmit time reference data to the computer system. The time reference data is indicative of the time reference of the movement data as generated by the timer. Masaki, col. 5, line 32 – 45; col. 6, lines 17 – 20; and figure 10.

Claim 19

Masaki teaches a force sensor configured to sense a force applied to the surface by the sensing device. Masaki, col. 3, lines 13 – 47.

Claim 20

Masaki teaches that the transmitter is configured to transmit force data to the computer system. The force data is indicative of the force. Masaki, col. 1, lines 38 – 45; col. 3, lines 54 – 60.

Claim 21

Masaki teaches a stroke detector configured to detect, by way of force, when the sensing device is applied to the surface and removed from the surface, thereby to identify the duration of the stroke. Masaki, col. 6, line 9 – col. 7, line 1.

Claim 22

Masaki teaches a marking nib 9. Masaki, col. 2, lines 44 – 57, figure 3.

Claim 23

Masaki teaches that the sensing device is in the form of a pen. Masaki, col. 2, lines 38 – 57, figures 1 and 2.

Art Unit: 2675

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Giobbi et al, USPN 5,469,193.

Claim 18

Bennett does not teach a wireless transmitter.

Giobbi teaches a cordless pointing apparatus for computer input wherein the transmitter is a wireless transmitter. Giobbi, col. 1, lines 51 – 63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for one to combine the cordless pointing apparatus of Giobbi with the position sensing device of Bennett to provide a cordless position sensing device. Giobbi invites such combination arguing, “no physical connection is required between the pointer 36 and the receiver 32...” Giobbi, col. 4, lines 13 – 14. Giobbi also states, “This system can be used as the basis of a computer input pointing device, such as a conventional pen or mouse, or in many other situations where the exact positioning and/or movement information of an object is required.” Giobbi, col. 4, lines 14 – 18.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 23 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner rejected applicants claims as anticipated or made obvious by Bennett et al. or Joyce. In response, applicants amended their claims and argued that neither Bennett nor Joyce describe the claims.

Bennett teaches a sensing device that uses coded data on a surface to determine the x and y position of the tip of the sensing device and the angle of the sensing device relative to the surface. Applicants argue Bennett does not teach a three dimension orientation of the sensing device. For example, in a three dimensional space, Bennett's invention would not describe the absolute position of the sensing device, only a cone with its point at the x and y position. The sensing device could be anywhere within that cone. Compare Bennett to Ward, USPN 6,184,873, for example. Ward teaches a sensing device which senses two points P1 and P2, each having an x and y position and an angle θ relative to the surface. Ward, figure 3. Ward would define an absolute position in three dimensions. Of course, Ward is not prior art to the claims because Ward does not use coded data to determine the orientation.

During examination, however, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. The words in a claim are generally not limited in their meaning by what is shown or disclosed in the specification. It is only when the specification provides definitions for terms appearing in the claims that the specification can be used in interpreting claim language. MPEP 2111.01.

The critical phrase is that, "the orientation data being indicative of three dimension of an orientation of the sensing device relative to the surface." The phrase has two problems.

The first is that it is only found in the preamble to the claim. The determination of whether a preamble limits a claim is made on a case-by-case basis in light of the facts in each case; there is no litmus test defining when a preamble limits the scope of a claim. *Catalina Mktg. Int'l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.*, 289 F.3d 801, 808, 62 USPQ2d 1781, 1785 (Fed. Cir. 2002). See

Art Unit: 2675

id. at 808-10, 62 USPQ2d at 1784-86 for a discussion of guideposts that have emerged from various decisions exploring the preamble's effect on claim scope, as well as a hypothetical example illustrating these principles. "[A] claim preamble has the import that the claim as a whole suggests for it." *Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp.*, 55 F.3d 615, 620, 34 USPQ2d 1816, 1820 (Fed. Cir. 1995). "If the claim preamble, when read in the context of the entire claim, recites limitations of the claim, or, if the claim preamble is necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality' to the claim, then the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim." *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165-66 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See also *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951) (A preamble reciting "An abrasive article" was deemed essential to point out the invention defined by claims to an article comprising abrasive grains and a hardened binder and the process of making it. The court stated "it is only by that phrase that it can be known that the subject matter defined by the claims is comprised as an abrasive article. Every union of substances capable inter alia of use as abrasive grains and a binder is not an abrasive article.'" Therefore, the preamble served to further define the structure of the article produced.). Thus, it is likely that the phrase in the preamble limits the claims.

The second is the use of the word "indicative." As used in the claim, indicative means, "serving to indicate." *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th ed. (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1999) p. 592. If this phrase is interpreted as broadly as its terms reasonably allow, then Bennett's sensing device that uses coded data on a surface to determine the x and y position of the tip and the angle of the sensing device relative to a surface is indicative of the three dimensional orientation of the device.

Double Patenting

8. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

9. Claims 1, 3 – 11, and 14 - 28 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 3 – 11, and 14 - 28 of copending Application No. 09/575,168. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Art Unit: 2675

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 1, 3 – 11, and 14 - 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, 3 – 11, and 14 - 28 of copending Application No. 10/291,469. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the this application and claim 1 of co-pending application no. 10/291,469 are substantially identical except that co-pending claim 1 teaches a memory adapted to store a sensing device identifier that is adapted to distinguish the sensing device from other sensing devices of the same type. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to produce the sensing device as described in co-pending claim 1 without the sensing device identifier.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leland Jorgensen whose telephone number is 703-305-2650. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. through 3:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven J. Saras can be reached on 703-305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Art Unit: 2675

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office, telephone number (703) 306-0377.

lrj



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600